

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON  
MEDFORD DIVISION**

**LIQUIDAGENTS  
HEALTHCARE, LLC,**

Plaintiff,

No. 1:20-cv-02225-CL

v.

**ORDER**

**EVANSTON INSURANCE  
COMPANY,**

Defendant.

---

AIKEN, District Judge.

This case comes before the Court on a Findings and Recommendation filed by Magistrate Judge Mark Clarke. ECF No. 125. Judge Clarke recommends that Defendant's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment, ECF No. 98, be denied and Plaintiff's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment, ECF No. 100, be granted.

Under the Federal Magistrates Act, the Court may "accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). If a party files objections to a magistrate judge's findings and

recommendations, “the court shall make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” *Id.*; Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3).

For those portions of a magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations to which neither party has objected, the Act does not prescribe any standard of review. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 152 (1985) (“There is no indication that Congress, in enacting [the Act], intended to require a district judge to review a magistrate’s report to which no objections are filed.”). Although no review is required in the absence of objections, the Magistrates Act “does not preclude further review by the district judge[] *sua sponte* . . . under a *de novo* or any other standard.” *Id.* at 154. The Advisory Committee Notes to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b) recommend that “[w]hen no timely objection is filed,” the court should review the recommendation for “clear error on the face of the record.”

In this case, Defendant has filed Objections, ECF No. 129, and Plaintiff has filed a Response, ECF No. 131. The Court has reviewed the record, the F&R, the Objections, and the Response and finds no error. The F&R, ECF No. 125, is ADOPTED. Defendant’s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment, ECF No. 98, is DENIED. Plaintiff’s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment, ECF No. 100, is GRANTED.

Defendant is ordered to pay Plaintiff’s defense costs in the underlying litigation, including the full amount of defense fees requested and the full amount of the settlement, minus the amount of the deductible under the Policy. To the extent

that Defendant moved to strike the statement of the Chase Farmer, that motion is DENIED.

It is so ORDERED and DATED this 22nd day of May 2025.

/s/Ann Aiken  
ANN AIKEN  
United States District Judge